

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Serandy Michelle Goff,  
Plaintiff,

v.

Nancy A. Berryhill, Acting Commissioner of  
Social Security Administration,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:18-cv-03313-TLW-MGB

**Order**

Plaintiff Serandy Michelle Goff filed this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §405(g) seeking review of the Commissioner of Social Security's decision to deny her application for Social Security Disability benefits. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of a Report and Recommendation (R&R) filed on January 8, 2019, by Magistrate Judge Baker, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. ECF No. 11. In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge recommends denying Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. *Id.* Objections to the R&R were due January 22, 2019, and Plaintiff has not filed objections. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the R&R, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

*Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations

omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has carefully reviewed the R&R in this case. Noting that Plaintiff filed no objections, the R&R, ECF No. 11, is hereby **ACCEPTED**. Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 4, is **DENIED**. Plaintiff shall have thirty days to pay the required filing fee.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Senior United States District Judge

March 27, 2019  
Columbia, South Carolina